DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 249 600 EA 017 147

TITLE Evaluation of the Unified Compensation and Classification Plan.
INSTITUTION Dade County Public Schools, Miami, FL. Office of Educational Accountability.
PUB DATE Mar 83
NOTE 40p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administration; *Compensation (Remuneration); Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Methods; Evaluation Needs; Experience; Inflation (Economics); *Job Analysis; *Occupational Information; *Promotion (Occupational); Salaries; Salary Wage Differentials; Staff Development
IDENTIFIERS Dade County Public Schools FL

ABSTRACT

The Unified Classification and Compensation Plan of the Dade County (Florida) Public Schools consists of four interdependent activities that include: (1) developing and maintaining accurate job descriptions, (2) conducting evaluations that recommend job worth and grade, (3) developing and maintaining rates of compensation for job values, and (4) maintaining equitability in the system. In the evaluation of these four areas serious problems were identified: job descriptions were incomplete; inappropriate factors were used to determine job worth; the grade-to-compensation conversion was not reasonable; and the administrative and maintenance activities did not keep the system current and equitable. The reasons for these problems are outlined and the report concludes that the system was flawed at its inception, had high inflation rates, was understaffed, and did not follow important procedureal requirements. The report recommends replacement of the system over a 9-month period and provides nine interim recommendations. Included are five appendixes and a bibliography. (MD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED249600

DADE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Miami, Florida

EVALUATION OF THE UNIFIED COMPENSATION AND CLASSIFICATION PLAN

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Stephenson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

EA 017 147

MARCH, 1983

THE SCHOOL BOARD OF DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA

Mr. G. Holmes Braddock, Chairman
Mrs. Ethel Beckham, Vice-Chairman
Mr. Paul L. Cejas
Dr. Michael Krop
Ms. Janet McAliley
Mr. Robert Renick
Mr. William H. Turner

Dr. Leonard Britton
Superintendent of Schools

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Unified Classification and Compensation Plan (UCCP) describes the job valuing and compensation system for 1,165 administrative, technical and executive employees distributed across 249 jobs (job grades 23 through 43). The current salary cost for the system is approximately $41,164,000. A study was made to evaluate the effectiveness of the UCCP in providing job pay for job worth and the conclusion is that the plan has not suceeded as a management tool.

The UCCP was somewhat deficient when it was first installed; and the circumstances, e.g., high rates of inflation, under which it has operated have not been conducive to its maintenance or improvement. Current knowledge and modern technology commend that the UCCP be replaced at the earliest opportunity by a more up-to-date, relevant program of management compensation which can be internally and externally equitable, individually motivating, easily administered and readily maintained.

Conceptually, the UCCP may be perceived as consisting of four interdependent activities. These are,

1. developing and maintaining accurate job descriptions,

2. conducting the factor-point evaluations necessary to make recommendations concerning the job's worth and grade;

3. developing and maintaining a grade-to-compensation schedule whereby a job's value establishes its rate of compensation, and

4. performing a variety of administrative and maintenance tasks which insure that the UCCP is timely, accurate, and internally and externally equitable.

The basic purposes of the UCCP are to establish job values/grades that reflect their worth to the District and to establish compensation rates which mirror job values. The four preceding activities are requisites for achieving these purposes. Highlights of the overall evaluation of each of the four activities are given below.

1. Current job descriptions are often incomplete and do not have a level of detail sufficient to guarantee accurate evaluation and grading. Moreover, based on a small sample of interviews, there are suggestions that the levels of responsibility, authority, etc. contained in some job descriptions are higher than those actually reported by job incumbents. Conversely, there is evidence that some types of jobs tend to be undervalued by the current system.

2. The factors used to evaluate the jobs and determine their worth are not appropriate for an educational system, and are ambiguous to an extent that the accuracy of the evaluations is questionable for many, perhaps most, jobs.

3. The grade-to-compensation conversion does not maintain a reasonable

relationship between job grade/value and rate of compensation. As judged by recommended compensation practice, there are too many grades, too small a salary differential between grades, and an increasing devaluation of each higher grade with grades 40 and up being seriously undervalued/undercompensated.

4. The administrative and maintenance activities are insufficient and cannot insure that the UCCP is current, and/or internally or externally equitable.* There are numerous reasons for this conclusion. The more important are,

   a. the entire UCCP system was somewhat flawed at its inception;

   b. high rates of inflation and an increase in the number of participants made it difficult, perhaps impossible, to develop and maintain a reasonable value-to-compensation relationship;

   c. the number and training of staff responsible for the immediate administration of UCCP is and has been insufficient; and

   d. several of the more important procedural requirements, e.g., conducting factor-point evaluations for all job grade changes and periodic reviews by external experts, have not been closely followed.

Recommendations

The general recommendation is that the current system be replaced. This involves creating new job descriptions; developing and implementing new job evaluation factors; restructuring of the value to compensation components, i.e., creating a new salary schedule; revising the UCCP procedures; and more closely adhering to the new procedures, once developed. It is anticipated that this replacement will cost between $30,000 to $60,000 and it will require six to nine months to effect. (This is a minimum estimate and assumes that the District will provide approximately 3 man-years of personnel assistance to help with the change.) Interim recommendations are listed below.

1. Freeze all jobs at the current grades, i.e., grant no reclassifications, until the new system is in effect.

2. Keep the number of new jobs to a minimum. And, when such jobs are created, their job descriptions and grades should be provisional and should be written in a manner that will not obligate the district to maintain the grade or salary beyond the time the new UCCP system is installed. The current job title, Special Project Manager, may be useful for this purpose.

* Examples of administrative and maintenance activities include biennially reviewing all classifications, conducting external salary surveys, and maintaining a computer data base to effectively audit the system.

3. Staff the administration of the UCCP appropriately. This will require a new position, as in 2 above, with at least a master's degree in Personnel Management and Compensation (Industrial Psychology) and two or three years' experience in business and/or industry as an officer for executive compensation, or an officer of one of the larger and more well-known consulting firms specializing in factor-point evaluation and compensation systems. This job should be described and filled as soon as possible to help with the new system, and should report directly to the Assistant Superintendent, Office of Personnel.

   Two or three lower level positions (one job) should be established to help in writing and auditing the new job descriptions, in conducting and securing the appropriate job pricing surveys, in instituting a computerized, function-based job coded system, and in conducting annual studies of the UCCP and other evaluation and compensation system(s) of the District which may require added support.

   The new Compensation Officers may be initially assigned the task of obtaining an estimate of the wage costs of a new compensation system. These costs may not be as high as some may expect and may be controlled by a wide variety of policy and procedure options. Specifically, jobs that are overpaid may have their responsibilities expanded to match their salaries; or they may be "red circled" or frozen until the overall wage scale increases to meet them. Increments budgeted (but not paid) for red circled positions can be used to fund adjustments to underpaid positions. Adjustments may be phased in over a period of time to ease the financial impact of any major change.

4. Consider establishing an advisory group, perhaps composed of personnel officers from selected Dade Partners, to conduct periodic reviews (no less than every third year) on all of the District's job evaluation and compensation programs.

5. Develop preliminary rules and procedures for adjusting salaries on the basis of the new system. It is believed that the value and compensation rates for a number of jobs will change under a new evaluation and compensation system and the effects of these changes should be anticipated.

6. Reorganize the current Review Committee to make it more diverse and more representative of the types of work and levels of jobs represented in the UCCP. The original Jacobs' recommendations might well be followed here. (See pg. 12 of this report.)

7. Consider an immediate increase in the salary schedule for jobs in the current UCCP grade range 40 and up. These are the grades that have been seriously undervalued by the past changes in scheduled compensation, and most of the affected jobs will be highly valued in

any reasonable factor-point system. Further, since there are comparatively few incumbents in these jobs (32 as of 2/1/83) and because of the need to expand the top of the current salary schedule, these increases should be given priority over those for other grades.

8. Any additional changes (to 7 above) in compensation rates for 1983-84 should be across the board, and should be based on a common percentage increase.

9. The installation of a new UCCP will require external expertise. While this external support should be secured on a bid basis, great care should be taken to insure that the potential contractors are acknowledged experts in the field of factor-point job valuing and compensation systems.

Note: Because of the complexity of the subject matter and the detailed nature of the study, this executive summary should not supplant the need for careful reading and review of the final report.

Dade County Public Schools
Office of Educational Accountability

EVALUATION OF THE UNIFIED COMPENSATION AND CLASSIFICATION PLAN

Prepared by the
Office of Educational Accountability

Dade County Public Schools
March, 1983

PREFACE

This report focuses on the evaluation of the District's Unified Compensation and Classification Plan (UCCP), the procedures and methods by which administrative (managerial, supervisory, and technical) jobs are valued/graded and job salary ranges established. As will subsequently be seen, the conclusions from the study indicate that there are substantial inadequacies in nearly every aspect of the UCCP. In essence, the report indicates that the UCCP problems are both systemic and environmental; that is, the UCCP was somewhat flawed at its inception and the historical environment, e.g. high rates of inflation, in which it has "operated" has been less than conducive to either its maintenance or improvement.

Given the essentially negative conclusions, several issues logically arise concerning the personnel responsible for administration of the UCCP and those responsible for the evaluation, i.e., those who are also "covered by" the UCCP.

Regarding OEA staff, the authors of the study were aware of the possibility of bias from the onset. Whether or not the possibility of bias was well handled is a judgement each reader must inevitably make for him/herself, given the report and the following considerations:

1. The UCCP grades for the authors are 31, 33, and 36. Each has been a UCCP participant, respectively, for less than one-half year, less than two years, and nine years.

2. One part of the report, the critique of the eleven Jacobs' factors used to establish the recommended job grades/values, is based in large measure on a "contracted" critique by Dr. Richard Henderson, the author of several leading texts on job evaluation and job compensation. A copy of Dr. Henderson's report is on file in OEA and will be made available for inspection by any interested reader.

Regarding staff from the Bureau of Personnel Management, the UCCP evaluation was requested by the current Assistant Superintendent, Office of Personnel after one full year's experience in dealing with the system. Moreover, the request was given a "highest priority" rating by personnel from all management areas. In a very real sense, the request to initiate the study and its priority rating were based on a sense of frustration with the current system. And, when information was requested regarding the UCCP's history or current functioning, it was, in so far as possible, provided without hesitation and with candor.

Concerning the specific content of the report, two topics that might be considered related to the UCCP evaluation are not addressed. The first of these is Performance Planning and Appraisal, i.e., the evaluation of individuals. The focus of the study is on the procedures for evaluating and compensating jobs, and these are considerations quite apart from the evaluation and compensation of individuals holding the jobs.

The second topic is external equity, one of the two equity issues fundamental to job evaluation and compensation. The general notion of equity focuses on the extent to which the jobs are appropriately valued and then compensated according to their worth. External equity addresses the parity between the value/compensation of jobs covered by the system and those not covered by the system. In the case of the UCCP, external equity considerations would focus on at least three external groups: other "bargaining" units within the district, groups similar to UCCP participants in other large districts, and similar public and private sector jobs within the immediate geographic vicinity. An extension of the current study into these areas was judged impractical given time and cost considerations. Thus, the principle focus of the study is on internal equity, the extent to which the UCCP provides a reasonable basis for valuing and compensating one UCCP job comparatively more or less than another.

In a different vein, notes of appreciation are extended to:

1. Mr. Irv Madnikoff, Personnel Manager of the Omni's J. C. Penny Store, who described the personnel compensation system for his company;

2. Ms. Beth Kleinman, of Florida, Power and Light Company, who described the personnel classification and compensation system used by F P & L, and who recommended that we contact the Hay Group for further elaboration on the F P & L system;

3. Ms. Cristine Morrison, Chief Personnel Compensation Officer, City of Bora Raton, who acquainted us with the Factor Evaluation System (FES) used by the Federal Government and who described in detail the importance of an appropriately staffed job evaluation review committee;

4. Dr. John Mueller and Mr. Robert Statton of the Atlanta Office of the Hay Group who provided three "uncharged" hours of consulting time; and who recommended Dr. Richard Henderson as the "expert" on the comparisons of the various factor point evaluation systems;

5. Dr. Bernard Ingster, a private job evaluation consultant who assisted Dr. Richard Henderson in his critique of the Jacobs factors; and to,

6. Dr. Richard Henderson who not only provided the "Jacobs critique" but also spent several hours providing additional background for his findings and offering information and advice well beyond the limits of his contract.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section		Page
Background, Summary and Conclusions		1
I.	The Job Descriptions	1
II.	The Factor-Point Evaluation System	2
III.	Job Value and Job Compensation	3
IV.	Administration and Maintenance of the UCCP	9
Bibliography		18
Appendices		
A.	Jacobs' Factors	20
B.	Comparison of Salaries in Industry with Salaries of Federal Employees under the General Schedule	21
C.	An Analysis of the Factor-Point Job Evaluations on File in the Office of Personnel	23
D.	Pay Grade Classifications	25
E.	1982-83 Salary Schedule, X-7, for Administrators and Supervisors	26

BACKGROUND, SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The basic purposes of the UCCP, or any rationally based job evaluation and compensation system, are to establish job values/grades that reflect their worth to the district and to establish compensation rates which mirror job values. The conclusion of the current study is that the UCCP, as currrently designed and administered, does not and cannot reasonably fulfill its basic purposes.

The job evaluation and compensation process may be viewed as consisting of four interdependent activities which are:

1. developing comprehensive job descriptions, which accurately characterize the major duties, responsibilities and accountabilities of each job;

2. establishing each job's worth by evaluating its description on the various compensable factors thought to accurately represent the district's major considerations for calculating job worth, e.g., knowledge and skills required, decision-making authority;

3. establishing a worth-to-compensation conversion such that the compensation level (and range) for each job is a valid reflection of its worth; and

4. conducting administrative and maintenance activities which insure the accuracy, objectivity, and equity of the system.

The evaluation of the UCCP focused on each of these components and each was found to be "problematic". Background information and a summary of the evaluation results are given below.

I. The Job Descriptions

The job description is the basic datum of the UCCP system. Only if its description is accurate can a job be appropriately valued and compensated. To assess the accuracy of the job descriptions, six jobs were selected and standard job-description interviews were conducted with two to three incumbents in each job.* On the basis of the interviews, more complete descriptions were written for the jobs and were sent to the interviewees for further revision and/or endorsement. The resulting descriptions were then compared with the official descriptions, and each was evaluated on the UCCP factors and on the Hay Group factors.

---

* A job is a set of duties, responsibilities, etc. sufficiently similar to be covered by a single job evaluation. A position is an instance of a job held by one incumbent. The UCCP manual generally uses the term "position" where "job" should be used.

The comparisons indicated that the official descriptions for two of the six jobs contained levels of responsibility and authority considerably greater than those reported by the interviewees. Another official job description covered diverse activities, some of which were conducted by one specialist grade incumbent, others by the second specialist. Interview responses indicated that there were probably two jobs rather than one, and subsequent factor-point evaluations indicated that the two jobs might receive different UCCP grades. A fourth senior executive job presented a different problem. In this case the official description did not clearly distinguish between those portions of the job carrying supervisory responsibility or accountability and those carrying advisory responsibility. This lack of clarity makes it difficult to evaluate the worth of the job, and perhaps more importantly, would make it very difficult to defend one's evaluation of an incumbent's performance on the job, should such be contested.

The results of the factor-point evaluations of the jobs followed the patterns noted above. Three of the six jobs were line administrators and three were staff specialists. The three line jobs currently have UCCP grades of 36, 38 and 39. The three staff jobs have grades of 28, 31 and 32. The factor-point evaluations indicated that the grades for the three line jobs were compressed. The three grade difference (36 to 39) would more appropriately have been a five to seven grade difference, depending on the job description and the factor evaluation system used. While the order of the grades was correct, the spacing between the grades was substantially incorrect. In effect, the current job value and corresponding compensation rates for at least two of the three executive jobs are inappropriate.

For the staff jobs, the order was not appropriate. The UCCP 32 and 28 jobs were found to be somewhat similar in value by both the UCCP/Jacobs' factor and the Hay Group factor evaluations. And when the interview-based descriptions were used, the jobs were found to be either equivalent or at most one grade apart in job value, both at UCCP grade 30 or lower.

The interview-based descriptions were also compared to the official descriptions. The results of this comparison indicate that the official descriptions do not sufficiently describe the content of the six jobs. Moreover, the inadequacies were such that accurate evaluations of the jobs would be difficult to conduct.

Overall, the analyses and comparisons indicated that at least three of the official job descriptions were of questionable accuracy and that all six were incomplete. To the extent that these findings are characteristic of other job descriptions, there is reason to question the accuracy not only of many of the job descriptions but also of their current grades and compensation rates.

II. The Factor-Point Evaluation System

The second portion of the UCCP system focuses on the factors used to determine job worth or value. In this portion, the job content from the job description is analyzed on each of the eleven UCCP job evaluation factors, and

tne sum of the value/points from each factor represents the worth of the job.

The factors used in the UCCP are those recommended by The Jacobs Company and adopted by the district in 1973. The appropriateness of the factors to educational activities; their clarity and ease of application; the extent to which the factors produce unbiased evaluation for jobs of differing types, e.g., managerial versus technical; and the extent to which the factors re-represent the "state of the art" were the main evaluation considerations.

To conduct an adequate evaluation of the eleven Jacobs' factors requires not only an analysis of the eleven factors but also knowledge of other factor-point evaluation systems. For this reason, the major portions of this part of the current study were conducted under contract by Dr. Richard Henderson, a recognized authority on job valuing and compensation systems. Concerning the appropriateness for evaluating educational jobs, the Jacobs' factors were judged to be inappropriate for reasons of omission and commission. Regarding omission, the eleven Jacobs' factors do not adequately represent such critical educational dimensions as leadership and program development. Regarding commission, several activities of questioned educational importance are represented in the factors "safety of others" and "physical demands". (A listing of the Jacobs' factors is provided in Appendix A.)

Regarding clarity, all the eleven factors are problematic, i.e., "the words and terms used to describe the factors...are at best, misleading, and ambiguous" (Henderson, 1982, p.5).

Regarding the possibility of bias in the factors where some types of jobs may be favored, the Jacobs' factors were judged to overvalue executive and administrative jobs while undervaluing administrative-technical and technical jobs.

Concerning the extent to which UCCP factors represent "the state of the art", "...the kind [factor-point] of job evaluation system currently used is...the best option available to Dade County Public Schools.... [However] the concepts presented in the [UCCP] manual relate to ideas and technology developed and implemented between middle 30's and 50's. The entire process is much better understood today...." (Henderson, 1982, p. 29).

Finally, "...the ambiguity [in the Jacobs' factors] makes it difficult... to make the critical inferential leap from the job content information to a specific degree of a factor. This problem casts a cloud on the evaluation of any job" (Henderson, 1982, p. 5).

III. Job Value and Job Compensation

The third step in the UCCP job valuing and compensation system establishes the relationship between job value and job compensation. The basic thesis of this relationship is that there should be a one-to-one relationship between the value of a job and the rate at which it is compensated. More formally, this relationship is described by a linear equation where the lowest valued and compensated job(s) establish the intercept, and the ratio of sal-

ary-dollars to factor-points establishes the slope. For example, if the lowest valued job has a salary of $10,000 and each additional factor-point value is worth $100, a job valued at ten points more than the $10,000 job would have a salary of $11,000 ($10,000 plus 10 x $100).

The facts that the factor-point evaluation of the job determines its worth and this worth translates directly to the compensation rate for the job are the major reasons the adequacy and accuracy of the factors and job descriptions are so important. If jobs are not evaluated correctly, they cannot be compensated correctly. Stated differently, if the jobs are not described and evaluated correctly, the organization has an insufficient basis for insuring the job is worth its compensation rate, and the employee has an insufficient basis for perceiving that he/she is being appropriately compensated for the work required by the job.

Over and above the linear relationship between value and compensation, standard personnel practice also recommends that four secondary principles govern compensation policy. The four major principles are described below.

First, there should be a range above and below the midpoint salary on which the linear, value-to-compensation, equation is based. The recommended salary range is 30 to 40 percent from the low to the high salary points for any job or grade.

Second, the salary overlap should encompass no more than four grades with progression through the range as a function of performance and/or experience. As a current example, the maximum salary for a UCCP 30 should just overlap the minimum salary for a UCCP 33 but no higher grade.

Third, the promotional increment should be ten to fifteen percent of the pre-promotional salary. In effect, the increase should be enough to alter the employee's perception of job worth.

Fourth, the number of grades in the compensation system should be sufficient to meet the three previous criteria and to provide a clear distinction between the grades' values/salaries, and the corresponding jobs' duties, responsibilities and accountabilities.* (References for these criteria come from Henderson, 1979 and 1981; Hay Group and FES publications; and Rock, 1972.)

The four above requirements are static state criteria. However, the nine years since the UCCP was adopted have not been static but rather have been characterized by unusually high rates of inflation and by increases in the number of UCCP staff.** Since each of these factors increases the dollar

---

* Some systems also use "working conditions" as a compensation consideration.

** In addition, the conversion of elementary and junior high school principals from ten to twelve month contracts in 1976 is not considered in this report, but did increase the annual UCCP cost by perhaps three percent over and above summer school.

requirements for the UCCP, they tend to stress the relationship between job value and compensation, and for this reason are included in this portion of the evaluation. (The Federal GS salary schedule, Appendix B, illustrates several of the above criteria.)

Consider first the effects of inflation. From 1973-74 through December, 1982, the Consumer Price Index, the standard measure of inflation rates, has increased by 110 percent. Stated differently, the 1973 dollar is now worth about 47.5¢.

The UCCP and most other compensation systems use grade and experience (performance and/or working conditions are also used in some systems) to set salary schedules. To stay on a par with inflation, both the basic salaries and the experience increments would have to increase comparably with the rate of inflation. For example, consider a basic salary of $25,000, an experience increment of 5 percent ($1,250) and an annual inflation rate of 10 percent. To account for inflation and provide the experience increment, the salary the following year would be $28,875, an increase of 15.5 percent, i.e., [(100% + 5%) x 1.10] - 100%. In effect, the $1250 experience increment at zero inflation must be increased to $3,875 in order to adjust for the effects of 10% inflation on both the base salary and the experience increment. Moreover, continued inflation compounds itself and amplifies the needed "par" adjustments each successive year.

For the UCCP to have kept up with inflation and also have provided growth/experience increments across the nine years would have required an increase of more than 110 percent. A reasonable estimate of the required increase is 130 to 135 percent, assuming an average of four growth increments by employees and depending on the four years the increments were given.*

In addition to the effects of inflation, the number of UCCP incumbents increased from 1,017 in 1973-74 to 1,165 in 1982-83, an increase of about 15 percent. This increase would also be compounded by the 130 to 135 percent and would yield an aggregated "needed" increase of 150 to 155 percent. In effect, to remain on a par with inflation, to provide for four experience increments and to absorb a staff increase of 15 percent, the needed percentage increase in the UCCP "budget" from 1973-74 through 1982-83 would have been from 150 to 155 percent.

From 1973-74 through 1982-83, the revenues for the district increased an es-

---

* The 130-135 percent assumes that the statistically average employee could or would have received four increments over the nine year period and that the increments would have increased according to the average annual inflation rate over the nine year period. If all employees could have received seven increments, the "required" increase would have exceded 155 percent. The statistically average employee, however, could not have received seven increments due to turnover, new employees, new positions, etc. during the nine year period.

timated 123 percent.* Given this, the UCCP wage bill could not have been maintained at the needed level (150% to 155%) without increasing its share of the district's total revenues. While the 123 percent increase was more than sufficient to keep salaries on a par with inflation (110%), it was not enough to provide an average of four experience increments (costing 20+ percent) or to accommodate a 15 percent increase in staff.**

From 1973-74 through 1982-83, the aggregate salaries for the UCCP increased from approximately $19,233,000 to $41,164,000. This increase of 114 percent while above the inflation rate (110%), was insufficient to accomodate the additional factors of increased staff, experience increments or promotional increments. Further, the 114 percent increase is nine percent below the estimated increase in revenues (123%); thus the UCCP's share of the district's revenues decreased over the nine year period, despite the 15% increase in staff.

These factors, inflation, staff increases, insufficient increases to accommodate experience and promotional increases and the comparative decrease in the share of revenue, all mitigate against adequate maintenance of the UCCP salaries and salary schedules, and thus have detrimentally affected the relationship between job value and job compensation.

The remainder of this portion of the UCCP evaluation focuses on two broad issues: how the salary schedules and salaries of UCCP incumbents were affected, and the extent to which four standard practice criteria (pg. 3 and 4) are met in the current UCCP salary schedule. Each of these considerations come to bear on the relationship between job value and job compensation, or correspondingly, between grade and salary schedule. These issues overlap to a considerable extent and for this reason the topical listing below will mix the general considerations.

1. From 1974-75 through 1982-83, the average salary of the UCCP incumbents (not necessarily the same individuals) increased from $21,028 to $35,153, a percentage increase of 67.2.*** During this period, the inflation increase was 88.9 percent as measured by the CPI. Thus, the loss in the real dollar value of the UCCP increases in salary over the eight years is substantial (approximately 22 percent) and would be even greater if the current salaries were evaluated against both inflation and experience adjustments.

2. From 1974-75 to 1982-83 the average grade of UCCP incumbents increased by eight-tenths, from 33.4 to 34.2. Thus the loss of real income is even greater for long-term holders of those UCCP jobs that have not been upgraded.

---

* The estimate is based on the increase in general fund.

** It should be noted that promotional increments have not been considered in any of the calculations.

*** All data involving the salary schedule date from 1973-74. When the number of incumbents is a factor, however, the data date from 1974-75, since the computer file layout made access to incumbent data in 1973-74 impractical.

3. Increases in the salary schedule and increases in the salaries paid incumbents were compared. On the average, increases in the schedule exceeded the increases for incumbents.

4. Changes in the UCCP salary schedules were examined across the nine years. The changes evidenced the following characteristics:

   a. The minimum salary for the lowest grade (UCCP 23) was increased slightly above the 110 percent inflation rate; the minimum salaries for the higher grades also increased but at successively lower rates at each higher grade. The net effect of this variable rate of increase was that the higher grades were being devalued, both in real dollar terms and as compared to the lower grades.

   b. The devaluation of the scheduled salaries was reasonably linear between grades 25 and 39, with each successive grade's midpoint salary showing an additional one-percent-per-grade reduction in purchasing power. At grades 40 and up, however, the "loss" accelerated more rapidly at approximately an additional five percent per grade. Grade 42 jobs, for example, have only three-quarters of the purchasing power they had in 1973-74. While the devaluation of the higher grades' scheduled salaries was effected in almost every annual salary schedule, the primary devaluation occurred in the 1977-78 schedule with a secondary devaluation in the 1981-82 schedule. As compared to these, other effects were comparatively minor.

   c. The effects of "b", on the basic premise of a linear relationship between job value and job compensation was examined in the 1973-74 and 1982-83 salary schedules. In the earlier schedule, each factor-point increase in job value produced a linear salary increment of approximately $118 between both low grade jobs and higher grade jobs. For 1982-83, however, the relationship was decidedly curvilinear. Specifically, the compensation rate of each point increase in job value between UCCP grades 24 and 25 is $244; and between grades 41 and 42 it is $52. In effect, the premise of "job pay for job worth" has been replaced by "job pay for job rank".

   d. Adjustments to the salary schedules and their effects on employee salaries were examined for consistency. Over the nine years there was little consistency in the approaches. The approaches appear as attempts to resolve one problem in one year and a different problem in the second year, and in the third year, attempting to resolve problems created by earlier "resolutions". In one year for example (1976-77), experienced employees at the maximum salary for their grade were the only incumbents to receive a full increment. Less experienced incumbents were given an across the board $150 increase, while entering employees were paid 20 percent more than similar employees the previous year. In another year (1981-82), adjustments were made that benefited the experienced employee who had remained in the same job for an extended period. However,

this adjustment penalized employees with equivalent amounts of experience but who had earlier received several promotions. Stated differently, the attempts at adjusting the salary schedules to deal with pressures caused by inflationary and staff increases, lacked consistency and a long-term rationale.

e. In addition to replacing the linear relationship between job value and compensation with a (negatively accelerating) curvilinear relationship (c. above),* other criteria were affected as follows:

- The recommended ten to fifteen percent increase between the job values and the compensation rates for each successive grade was not achieved in the original Jacobs' system; in the original system, the difference did tend to increase across the grades reaching a maximum of 12 percent between grades 39 and 40. In 1981-82 the grade-to-grade difference in compensation rate was set at 4.375 percent. Thus, this recommended criteria is not satisfied.

- The criteria of a promotional increase of ten to fifteen percent was, on the average, reasonably well satisfied in the original system (too high in some cases, too low in others). The current system, however, produces a 4.375 increase for some "promotions" but not for others. In the current UCCP procedures, a distinction is made between "promotion", i.e., changing jobs (and grades) and "reclassification", i.e., holding a job that has changed in grade. In the former case, the 4.375 percent is given immediately, in the latter case, it is given only after the maximum salary for the old grade would have been exceeded. Thus, not only is the current promotion increment too small, the distinction regarding "when it is given" is artificial--having no basis in the standard practice of job valuing, or in the compensation literature.

- The recommended within-grade salary range of approximately 35 percent has been maintained throughout the UCCP history.

- The recommendation that the salary overlap should encompass no more than four grades has never been met. Further, it has been even less well met since 1981-82 when the between-grade differential was set at the same 4.375 percent value as the experience-step differential. The current overlap encompasses eight grades. As examples,

---

* The curvilinear relationship resulted from the compression of the salary range achieved by increasing the salaries for the lower grades much more than for the higher grades.

the maximum salary for a UCCP grade 30 Buyer is the same as the minimum salary for a Junior High School Principal (UCCP 37); the maximum salary for an Elementary Principal (UCCP 36) is the same as the minimum salary for an Associate Superintendent (UCCP 43). Simply put, the current grade-to-grade salary differential is insufficient.

- The requirement that the number of grades be sufficient to provide sufficient differentials between corresponding salaries and duties/responsibilities has never been met by the UCCP. Since its inception there have been too many UCCP grades, i.e., there has been too little difference between the job values (and salaries) of adjacent grades. And, with the compression in the salary range over the nine years, the problem has been amplified. The magnitude of this problem is best illustrated with the salary overlap figures earlier noted, i.e., a Junior High Principal with maximum experience making the same salary as a beginning Associate Superintendent. Standard practice recommends a ten to fifteen percent difference between the average job values and salaries of adjacent grades. The current salary differential of 4.375 percent, which does not adequately reflect job value, is too small.

  The lack of a sufficient difference between the factor-point values of adjacent grades is also problematic because it does not provide a clear distinction between the values of jobs in the various grades. In effect, the incumbent (and personnel-function administrators) may not be able to perceive such small differences and may be able to develop an arguable case that his/her job is not a UCCP xx but is really one or two grades higher. This imperceptiblity may be one of the reasons that approximately one-third of the UCCP jobs (not positions) have been upgraded over the last two years.

Regarding the overall job-value-to-compensation system, the number of UCCP grades is too large and should be reduced. The current 4.375 percent salary difference between adjacent grades is too small and should be increased. The overall salary range (from UCCP 23 through UCCP 43) has been compressed and should be increased, especially at the highest grades. And most importantly, a linear relationship between job value and job compensation should be reestablished.

IV. Administration and Maintenance of the UCCP

Appropriate administration and maintenance of the system is the fourth and final sequential requirement. If the UCCP were optimal in each of the three preceeding elements, its end results could be seriously flawed by insufficient administration and maintenance.

While a listing of optimum conditions for appropriate administration and maintenance would be quite long, there are at least five conditions which

should be met by the factor-point compensation system of a public sector organization. These are:

1. an adequate number of sufficiently trained staff--for the purpose of training others to write job descriptions, reviewing job descriptions, objectively grading the jobs on the various factors, conducting periodic job audits, conducting periodic market surveys to insure reasonable job pricing, etc.;

2. dissemination and training activities so that those responsible for and those affected by the system understand its purpose, composition, and application and thus have a vested interest in its maintenance;

3. a review committee, of sufficiently diverse composition to represent the major job families (e.g., principals, auditors) and of either mid or varied grade levels so that the various grades and types of employees feel represented in the review and recommendation processes;

4. a logical, exhaustive and consistent set of procedures for defining and specifying the administrative authority for the system;

5. a committment from top management and policy makers to insure the continued integrity, equity and objectivity of the system.*

While these five requirements are conceptually distinct, in practice they are threads of a common cloth. And, for this reason there will be some overlap in the following sections which assess the UCCP on each requirement.

1. The Number and Training of Staff

Currently, there are two positions charged with responsibility for direct administration of the UCCP. These positions are the Assistant Superintendent, Office of Personnel, and the Wage and Salary Administrator. Each of these positions has other numerous and diverse responsibilities, and each incumbent reports spending less than 20 percent of his time dealing directly with the administration of the UCCP. In effect, the grade and compensation system for 1100+ individuals, occupying almost 250 different jobs, and "costing" approximately $41,164,000, is administered by the equivalent of less than one-half a full time professional position.

Regarding training, a similar situation exists. Neither of the job descriptions of the two above noted incumbents require advanced degrees/

---

* These five requirements are not listed in any single document but are based on interviews with private and public-sector personnel officers, university professors, textbooks, and literature produced by personnel management firms.

training in the management of compensation systems and neither of the incumbents have such training. Rather, both have advanced degrees (and experience) in administration and/or supervision.

2. Dissemination and Training

The factor-point evaluation system should be not only adequate and equitable but also understandable. Being "understandable" is a characteristic of the system (albeit one on which the "Jacobs" is somewhat lacking); dissemination and training are activities that maximize the likelihood that incumbents and the policymakers will understand the system and as a consequence perceive its objectivity and equity.

Currently, the primary dissemination of information on the UCCP occurs in the annually issued document, Unified Compensation and Classification Plan for Exempt Personnel: 1982-83. The number of copies of the document is sufficient for the number of personnel covered by the UCCP. The content covers such topics as policies and procedures, job description components, classification appeal procedures, etc. However, the only references to the factor-point system state essentially that a factor point system is used in recommending pay grades for various "positions".* The eleven Jacobs' factors are neither listed nor described; no rationale is provided for the use of a factor-point system, the need for accurate job descriptions, etc.

No formal attempt is made to describe the "system" to new employees, no inservice activities are undertaken to explain the procedures to new managers, e.g., supervisors, directors. In effect, the dissemination of the system is inadequate.

3. The Review Committee

In most, if not all, personnel "grading" functions, a review committee external to the Personnel Department is used. The purposes served by such committees are several but the principal ones include:

- providing an independent review of the decisions made by the Personnel Department, and
- serving as a two-way communication link between top management and the rank and file of the various job groups covered by the compensation system, the purpose being not only to provide representation of and to the various job groups and levels but also to provide the perception of this representation.

---

* By contrast, FP & L has a six page brochure describing the essentials of their factor-point grading system and general methods of compensation. Their personnel staff holds two open inservice sessions annually and attempts are made to provide new managers with an understanding of the basics of the system.

The review committee recommended by The Jacobs Company consisted of three pairs of individuals, one member of each pair from an "instructional" and the other from non-instructional occupation. The three pairs were to come from three different grade ranges: UCCP 37 and above, UCCP 32.5 to 36.5, and UCCP 32 and below. One additional member acting as secretary and technical advisor to the committee, who was able to vote only in case of a tie, was to represent the Division of Personnel (Jacobs, pg. 29).

The current Review Committee consists of the three associate superintendents (Personnel, Business and Education). Given the composition, grade levels, and responsibilities of the current committee, it is doubtful that its members can serve either of the two basic functions well, no matter how well intended they may be.

First of all, each member has a very demanding job so the amount of time that can be devoted to the review process is probably less than optimal. Secondly, their numbers are too few to be able to represent the diverse job groups covered by the UCCP. Thirdly, each reports directly to the Superintendent and one is the chief personnel officer, so their independence from both the personnel function and top management can be perceived as difficult to maintain. And finally, their UCCP grades are too high to be perceived as reasonably representative of various grade-levels covered by the UCCP.

4. The Authority and Procedures for Administering the System

The authority to establish jobs and rates of compensation rests, by law, with the Board which acts on recommendations made by the Superintendent. By policy, the recommendations for new jobs and grades are made to the Superintendent by the Assistant Superintendent, Office of Personnel.* Also by policy, recommendations for reclassification, i.e., changing the grade of an existing job, are made to the Superintendent by the Review Committee (UCCP, 1982-83). These reclassification recommendations are made after the Assistant Superintendent, Office of Personnel, has submitted his/her recommendation to the Committee. In the case of both new and old positions, the Assistant Superintendent's recommendations are to be based on the factor-point evaluation results (UCCP, pg. 2).

In both cases the recommendations to the Superintendent are advisory. The Superintendent's recommendations to the Board may be made on factors over and above the recommendations from the Assistant Superintendent or the Review Committee. Procedures for appealing the reclassification recommendations directly to the Superintendent also exist.

In addition to the above, other UCCP procedural elements include the following:

a. no position shall be filled until it has been classified (factor point evaluated) by the Assistant Superintendent, Office of Personnel (pg. 1, 4);

---

* In the UCCP manual, this position is also referred to as "the Assistant Superintendent for Personnel".

b. all classifications shall be reviewed biennially (pg. 2);

c. periodic studies shall be conducted to insure that the UCCP is current and uniform (pg. 2);

d. an established position may be reclassified as a result of a change in duties and responsibilities; (however) reclassifications do not apply to situations involving the assignment of new duties and responsibilities that in effect create new positions, (pg. 4, 5);

e. job-codes--the official number--shall be used to identify each job (pg. 3);

f. no position shall be reclassified within six months...or more than once within a twelve month period (pg. 5); and

g. recommendations for maintaining a competitive compensation plan shall be made, and actions in respect to all other salary plans must take this into account (pg. 10).*

Consider first the administrative authority for the UCCP. The Assistant Superintendent, Office of Personnel, is responsible for the administration of the U.C.C.P. and for making certain recommendations to the Superintendent. The Assistant Superintendent also reports directly to the Associate Superintendent, Bureau of Personnel Management, who is a member of the Review Committee. The possibility of an authority problem occurs should the Assistant Superintendent's recommendation differ from that of the Associate Superintendent. Second, grade recommendations for new jobs are given to the Superintendent by the Assistant Superintendent but those for reclassification come from the Review Committee. In effect, for reclassifications, the Review Committee assumes the personnel department's function, rather than operating in an advisory capacity as it should and was intended in the original Jacob's recommendations (Jacobs, pg. 29). Third, from time to time the grades for various jobs and the grade-to-compensation conversions have been subject to negotiation with the Administrator's Association, outside of the approved procedures for requesting reclassification. While the Superintendent and Board clearly have the authority to engage in such negotiations, it is unclear as to whether such negotiations can occur without suspending the UCCP procedures. In any case, such negotiations weaken the authority of the office responsible for the administration of the UCCP and may well produce different results than would be obtained from the factor point evaluations. A fourth problem occurs during the periods of reorganization. During these periods, numerous changes in duties and responsibilities may occur, especially at the higher grades. And when the number of changes are large, they may exceed the personnel functions' capacity to follow adopted procedures, i.e., develop new job descriptions, and determine the recommended job grades by the application of factor-point evaluation procedures. In such cases, job worth is determined on other bases, and both the control over the system

---

* All citations are from the 1982-83 UCCP manual.

and the parity/ equity within the system are weakened.

Consider next the procedural elements of the UCCP (a-g previously listed):

a. No position shall be filled until it has been classified. Both classification and reclassification recommendations for job grades are to be based on the factor-point evaluation of the job. Thus, it would be reasonable to assume that such evaluations are available for each of the UCCP jobs, even if the current grades are different from those resulting from the factor-point evaluations. However, according to the Assistant Superintendent, Office of Personnel, only 26 jobs have such evaluations in current form, and the majority of these are the result of recent requests for reclassification. In effect, only ten percent of the UCCP jobs have current and immediately accessible factor-point evaluations.* (Appendix C is an analysis of the data generated by the reclassification of these 26 jobs.)

   In addition, the information from a variety of sources reveal that a number of jobs on the UCCP may not be accurately valued. Four such sources warrant note. First, both the current and past Assistant Superintendents, Office of Personnel, have indicated that grades of many, perhaps most, positions are one to two grades higher than the grades suggested by the factor-point evaluations, and that the evaluations are rarely used to downgrade jobs. Second, the job analysis and revised factor-point evaluations for at least two of the six positions discussed in the section on job descriptions (pg. 2) are lower than the current grades would indicate. Third, a computer analysis of all UCCP positions in June of 1975 and December of 1982 indicate that the average grade for the later year is 0.8 units higher (33.4 to 34.2).** Fourth, by-year analysis of the 12 "example" jobs used by The Jacobs Company to train the initial review committee also shows an average increase in grade.*** (The history for these twelve positions is provided in Appendix D.)

b. All classifications shall be reviewed bienially. According to both current and past Assistant Superintendents, Office of Personnel, these biennial reviews have never occurred, principally because, with limited staff, other responsibilities took precedence.

---

* Historical records of the evaluations for all positions prior to 1980 did exist, but were stored in warehouses and were not immediately accessible. The above records were examined in November, 1982.

** Approximately 30 percent of the jobs were upgraded in 1982-83. Some upgrades were substantial, four to six grades. The number of positions affected was not calculated but would be less than 30 percent since the "realignment" did not include school administrators, most of whom had been upgraded in 1981-82.

***Consideration was given to computerized tracking of all UCCP jobs to determine which jobs or job types had changed the most and the least over the seven year period. Such tracking would have to be conducted on the basis of job codes, the four digit number characterizing each job. The codes, however, have changed in a non-systematic manner over time, and for this reason the task was judged to be impractical.

c. Periodic studies shall be conducted to insure that the UCCP is current and uniform.* Only one study has been attempted since Jacobs/UCCP was adopted in 1973. That study was conducted in 1980 by the local office of Peat, Marwick and Mitchell.** No action was taken on the firm's recommendation to the effect that the UCCP needed substantial improvement.

d. An established position may be reclassified as a result of change in duties and responsibilities; however, reclassifications do not apply to situations involving new duties and responsibilities that in effect create a new position. There are many problems related to this requirement. However, the basic one has to do with the conceptual basis of the distinction. Conceptually, neither the UCCP nor any other job valuing system distinguishes between a reclassified job and a new job. Simply put, jobs are valued on the basis of worth; old or new is immaterial.***

e. Job codes shall be used to identify each job. As the procedures stipulate, job codes exist for each authorized job. However, the codes have changed several times over the years, and most of the changes were asystemic. For this reason, it is not possible to trace, other than through manual procedures, the histories of jobs. More importantly, the job codes are unique identification numbers rather than functional numbers such as used in the Dictionary of Occupational Titles. The advantage of functional numbers is that they are useful for purposes of data extraction. Suppose, for example, that certain digits indicated the primary function of the job (e.g., instruction, finance); other digits indicated the secondary function; still other digits the level of supervision exercised by the job, and so on. Given such codes, one could determine, for example, the distribution of personnel across any primary function, the salary costs by function, etc. Moreover, changes along these dimensions could be investigated across varying points in time.

In a related sense, job code information could be included in the job code file, especially factor point results for each separate job. Such information would be exceedingly useful in reviewing requests for reclassification. If, for example, an incumbent in a job requested a reclassification, it would be useful be useful to know about the factor point profiles of other jobs requiring similar levels of training and experience. Indeed, current UCCP policy requires a factor-by-factor comparison between the job under scrutiny and its job class. In summary, job codes identifying each job do exist, but by virtue of their "identification-only" design, they do not support any other information need of

---

* Under the UCCP Manual's section for "Technical Personnel" (a distinction which will be discontinued), it also states that salary surveys and studies of all pay grade assignments will be made at least every three years (UCCP, pg. 10).

** PM & M is a management consulting firm, apparently not well known in job compensation and evaluation.

*** One might respond that a change in job codes is the differentiation. But such a response "begs the question" as rules defining the point at which a job's code can be changed are not stipulated in current procedures; and if they were, they still face the problem noted under "a".

the district and the personnel function.*

f. No position shall be reclassified within six months...or more than once in a twelve month period. At the beginning of the 1982-83 fiscal year, approximately thirty percent of the 249 UCCP jobs were upgraded.** Based on memoranda submitted to the Superintendent by the Bureau of Personnel Management, the upgrades were accomplished in one or more of four Board items. The dates for the four memoranda were May 27, 1982; June 11, 1982; June 16, 1982; and July 6, 1982. The memoranda were initially reviewed in order to determine the number and types of job classification changes made for the new fiscal year. The purpose of this review was subsequently changed when it was found that various memoranda (and the resulting Board action) were not consistent. Specifically, some jobs were listed as reclassification upgrades when they were not; other jobs were at one time listed as new jobs and at other times listed as reclassified jobs.*** In effect, it became impossible to get an exact count of the number and types of job changes, a condition caused in part by a lack of sophisticated, computer-based, data-management procedures.

Given these problems, the job codes for several "positions" were manually tracked across the four memoranda. Two were found to have been changed twice within a six months interval. The first of these, job code 0225, was upgraded from a UCCP 34 to a UCCP 36 by Board action on June 9, 1982 and was upgraded again on July 7, from UCCP 36 to UCCP 37. The second job, code 0222, was upgraded from a UCCP 37 to a UCCP 38 on June 9, 1982 and was later (prior to mid December, 1982) upgraded again to a UCCP 39.

As earlier noted, current UCCP procedures prohibit more than one reclassification of a job within a twelve month period. It may be that these latter upgrades were intended as promotions to new jobs rather than reclassifications of old jobs. In this case, however, the job codes should have changed. The

---

* The current job code is a four digit number. If functional job codes were used the number of digits would have to be expanded to six or perhaps eight digits.

** According to the Assistant Superintendent, Office of Personnel, the majority of these changes occurred at Board direction through a process termed "realignment". However, this process has no basis in job valuing literature; and it is unclear whether it can be accomplished without the suspension of these UCCP procedures which require that grade recommendations be based on factor-point evaluations.

***The major problem here lies in the disagreement between earlier memoranda (and Board actions) and the one of July 6, 1982. As an example of the disagreements, the Supervisor I, Office of Educational Accountability, was listed as a new job on June 11, 1982 and as a reclassified job on July 6, 1982. The Evaluation Specialist II job was listed on July 6, 1982 as a reclassification from UCCP grade 31 to UCCP grade 33. However, this job has been a UCCP 33 since 1974-75. While several jobs from other responsibility areas were similarly affected, the OEA positions are used as examples because their histories are known and do not require a substantial search of historical records.

old code should have been removed from the listing of Authorized Positions and a new job code should have been added. And, in both cases, Board action would be logically preferred, if not required. Moreover, these changes in job codes would seem to be mandatory, given: (a) the current distinction between reclassification and promotion, (b) the need to have an accurate and exhaustive list of authorized positions--filled and unfilled--and (c) the need to monitor both the type and quantity of job changes.

g. The Maintainence of a Competitive Salary Plan is a necessary step in insuring the external equity of the UCCP.* There are several sources of information which may be used to monitor external equity. These are market or job pricing surveys conducted by the district; similar surveys conducted by other organizations, such as, Computerworld for data processing; area wage surveys by the U.S. Department of Labor; research agency reports, such as, the Educational Research Service reports on teacher, principals, salaries, etc.; and reports produced for the users of specific factor-point evaluation systems-- both the Hay Group and the Factor Evaluation System produce annual factor point salary survey results.

   Currently, with the exception of the Educational Research Service Reports, the staff responsible for administration of the UCCP do not avail themselves of these sources of information. Thus, the information necessary to monitor external equity is insufficient. And, given the relative lack of appropriate information, it is doubtful that a truly competitive and externally equitable salary plan can be maintained.

5. The commitment from top management and policy makers to insure that the integrity, equity and objectivity of the UCCP is reasonably maintained,

   In a general sense this commitment has been the subject of previous portions of this report. As has been seen, the level of support has not been sufficient to adequately maintain the system; and as a consequence, the current UCCP is in a state of disrepair.

---

* As noted in the Preface, this evaluation makes no attempt to determine whether the UCCP is externally equitable. The above discussion focuses on informational requirements to monitor external equity, not on external equity per se.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Dade County Public Schools. System for Classification and Reclassification of Administrative, Technical and Executive Positions. Miami: Author, 1973.

_____. Unified Compensation and Classification Plan for Administrative, Supervisory and Technical Personnel, 1973-1974. Miami: Author, 1973.

_____. Unified Compensation and Classification Plan for Exempt Personnel, 1982-83. Miami: Author, 1982.

_____. Salary Handbook, 1982-83. Miami: Author, 1982.

Hay Associates. A Brief Introduction to the Work of Hay Associates in Developing and Implementing a Management Approach to the Compensation Program. Atlanta: Author, 1974.

Henderson, Richard I. Compensation Management: Rewarding Performance. (3rd ed.). Reston, Va.: Reston Publishing Co., 1979.

_____, & Clarke, Kitty Lewis. Job Pay for Job Worth. Atlanta: College of Business Administration, Georgia State University, 1981.

_____. Analysis of the Current Classification System and Recommendations for Improvement for Dade County Public Schools. Atlanta: Author, 1982.

The Jacobs Company. Proposal to Develop a Management Compensation and Classification Plan for the Dade County Public School System. Chicago: Author, 1970.

_____. Manual: Classification and Compensation Administration for Administrative, Technical and Executive Personnel, Dade County Public Schools. Chicago: Author, 1971.

_____. Professional/Managerial Performance Appraisal Manual, Dade County Public Schools. Chicago: Author, 1971.

_____. Manual: System for the Evaluation of Administrative, Technical and Executive Personnel. Chicago: Author, 1971.

_____. Report on the Development of a Unified Classification Plan and a Performance-Oriented Compenstion Plan for Administrative, Technical and Executive Personnel, Dade County Public Schools. Chicago: Author, 1971.

Rock, Milton L. (Ed.) Handbook of Wage and Salary Administration. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972.

U. S. Civil Service Commission. Instructions for the Factor Evaluation System. (T. S. 27) Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1977.

U. S. Department of Labor. National Survey of Professional, Administrative, Technical, and Clerical Pay, March 1982. (Bulletin 2145). Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1982.

_____. Area Wage Survey: Miami, Florida, Metropolitan Area, October, 1982. (Bulletin 3015-52). Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1982.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

JACOBS' FACTORS

Factor Number	Maximum Points	Relative Value
1. Education - kind and mimimum amount required	22	(09%)
2. Previous Experience - kind and minimum amount required	34	(14%)
3. Supervision Exercised - number and complexity of positions supervised	16	(07%)
4. Policy and Methods - explanation, enforcement, interpretation, participation in development	32	(14%)
5. Assets - materials and supplies, facilities and equipment, money	32	(14%)
6. Personal Contacts - with officials of other units, civic organizations, parents, general public	21	(09%)
7. Records and Reports - volume, complexity, importance, confidentiality	21	(09%)
8. Safety of Others - kind and extent of care which must be exercised, probability, and severity of accidents or illness which may result from lack of care and attention	06	(02%)
9. Problem Solving - variety and complexity of tasks, importance of decisions made, frequency and difficulty of problems; extent of planning, initiative, innovation and creativity required	37	(16%)
10. Mental Demands - attention, concentration and other pressures resulting in mental fatigue	11	(05%)
11. Physical Demands - severity of exertion required, frequency and duration of physical effort, amount of dexterity required	05	(02%)
TOTALS	235	(100%)

APPENDIX B

Comparison of Salaries in Private Industry with Salaries of Federal Employees under the General Schedule*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The survey was designed to provide a basis for comparing salaries under the General Schedule classification and pay system with salaries in private enterprise. To assure collection of pay data for work levels equivalent to the General Schedule grade levels, the Office of Personnel Management (OPM), in cooperation with the Bureau of Labor Statistics, prepared the occupational work level definitions used in the survey. Definitions were graded by OPM according to standards established for each grade level. Table D-1 shows the surveyed jobs grouped by work levels equivalent to General Schedule grade levels.

Table D-1. Comparison of average annual salaries in private industry with salary rates for Federal employees under the General Schedule

Occupation and level surveyed by BLS[1]	Average annual salary in private industry[2] March 1982	Salary rates for Federal employees under the General Schedule, March 1982[3]										
		Grade[4]	Average[5] March 1982	Step[6]								
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
File clerks I	$8,816	GS 1	$8,440	$8,342	$8,620	$8,898	$9,175	$9,453	$9,015	$9,990	$10,185	$10,179	$10,439
Messengers	9,999												
Accounting clerks I	10,479	GS 2	9,587	9,381	9,603	9,913	10,713	10,292	10,599	10,998	11,201	11,504	11,807
Drafters I	11,738												
File clerks II	10,474												
Key entry operators I	11,771												
Typists I	10,893												
Accounting clerks II	12,488	GS 3	10,915	10,235	10,576	10,917	11,258	11,599	11,940	12,281	12,622	12,963	13,304
Drafters II	14,257												
Engineering technicians I	14,688												
File clerks III	12,294												
Key entry operators II	13,956												
Personnel clerks/assistants I	11,708												
Stenographers I	14,987												
Typists II	13,723												
Accounting clerks III	14,713	GS 4	12,739	11,490	11,873	12,256	12,639	13,022	13,405	13,788	14,171	14,554	14,937
Computer operators I	11,956												
Drafters III	17,048												
Engineering technicians II	17,246												
Personnel clerks/assistants II	14,122												
Purchasing assistants I	13,589												
Secretaries I	14,009												
Stenographers II	18,084												
Accounting clerks IV	18,093	GS 5	14,539	12,854	13,292	13,710	14,128	14,566	14,934	15,422	15,850	16,278	16,706
Accountants I	18,260												
Auditors I	17,301												
Buyers I	18,074												
Chemists I	19,840												
Computer operators II	13,808												
Drafters IV	20,964												
Engineers I	23,622												
Engineering technicians III	20,219												
Job analysts I	18,373												
Personnel clerks/assistants III	15,718												
Photographers II	18,773												
Purchasing assistants II	17,117												
Secretaries II	14,936												
Programmers/Programmer analysts I	17,335												
Computer operators III	15,804	GS 6	16,442	14,329	14,808	15,284	15,762	16,240	16,718	17,196	17,674	18,152	18,630
Personnel clerks/assistants IV	18,432												
Purchasing assistants III	22,276												
Secretaries III	17,051												

See footnotes at end of table

*National Survey of Professional, Administrative, Technical and Clerical Pay, March, 1982, U. S. Department Labor, Bulletin 2145, Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 20402.

Table D-1. Continued—Comparison of average annual salaries in private industry with salary rates for Federal employees under the General Schedule

Occupation and level surveyed by BLS[1]	Average annual salary in private industry[2] March 1982	Salary rates for Federal employees under the General Schedule, March 1982[3]										
		Grade[4]	Average[5] March 1982	Step[6]								
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Accountants II	$22,068	GS 7	$18,007	$15,922	$16,453	$16,984	$17,515	$18,046	$18,577	$19,108	$19,639	$20,170	$20,701
Auditors II	22,065												
Buyers II	22,174												
Chemists II	23,474												
Computer operators IV	19,325												
Drafters V	25,909												
Engineers II	26,060												
Engineering technicians IV	23,620												
Job analysts II	19,300												
Photographers III	22,425												
Public accountants I	17,268												
Secretaries IV	18,503												
Programmers/Programmer analysts II	20,829												
Computer operators V	22,880	GS 8	20,483	17,834	18,222	18,810	19,398	19,986	20,574	21,162	21,750	22,338	22,926
Secretaries V	21,548												
Accountants III	25,873	GS 9	21,811	19,477	20,129	20,775	21,424	22,073	22,722	23,371	24,020	24,669	25,318
Attorneys I	25,187												
Auditors III	26,502												
Buyers III	27,434												
Chemists III	28,018												
Computer operator VI	23,267												
Engineers III	29,311												
Engineering technicians V	26,781												
Job analysts III	25,028												
Photographers IV	25,392												
Public accountants II	16,177												
Programmers/Programmer analysts III	25,192												
Accountants IV	31,888	GS 11	26,594	23,588	24,352	25,138	25,934	26,710	27,498	28,282	29,068	29,864	30,640
Attorneys II	31,086												
Auditors IV	32,004												
Buyers IV	33,408												
Chemists IV	34,047												
Chief accountants I	34,509												
Directors of personnel I	31,138												
Engineers IV	34,443												
Job analysts IV	31,221												
Public accountants III	22,330												
Programmers/Programmer analysts IV	29,363												
Accountants V	38,680	GS 12	32,088	28,248	29,137	30,129	31,071	32,013	32,955	33,897	34,839	35,781	36,723
Attorneys III	38,648												
Chemists V	40,107												
Chief accountants II	38,708												
Directors of personnel II	38,188												
Engineers V	40,977												
Public accountants IV	27,286												
Programmers/Programmer analysts V	33,430												

See footnotes at end of table.

Table D-1. Continued—Comparison of average annual salaries in private industry with salary rates for Federal employees under the General Schedule

Occupation and level surveyed by BLS[1]	Average annual salary in private industry[2] March 1982	Salary rates for Federal employees under the General Schedule, March 1982[3]										
		Grade[4]	Average[5] March 1982	Step[6]								
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Accountants VI	$48,549	GS 13	$38,571	$33,588	$34,708	$35,829	$36,949	$38,086	$39,186	$40,308	$41,429	$42,548	$43,668
Attorneys IV	49,819												
Chemists VI	48,971												
Chief accountants III	50,414												
Directors of personnel III	47,353												
Engineers VI	47,442												
Attorneys V	61,579	GS 14	46,713	39,689	41,102	42,335	43,658	44,981	46,304	47,627	48,950	50,273	51,596
Chemists VII	53,658												
Chief accountants IV	61,236												
Directors of personnel IV	57,899												
Engineers VII	54,338												
Attorneys VI	78,232	GS 15[7]	53,513	46,886	48,241	49,737	51,233	52,909	54,465	56,021	57,577	59,133	60,689
Engineers VIII	62,494												

[1] For definitions, see appendix C.
[2] Survey findings, as summarized in table 1 of this bulletin. For scope of survey, see appendix A.
[3] General Schedule rates in effect in March 1982, the reference date of the PATC survey.
[4] Corresponding grades in the General Schedule were supplied by the Office of Personnel Management.
[5] Mean salary of all General Schedule employees in each grade as of Mar. 31, 1982. Not limited to Federal employees in occupations surveyed by BLS.
[6] Section 5335 of title 5 of the U.S. Code provides for within-grade increases on condition that the employee's work is of an acceptable level of competence as defined by the head of the agency. For employees who meet the condition, the service requirements are 52 calendar weeks each for advancement to salary rates 2, 3, and 4; 104 weeks each for advancement to salary rates 5, 6, and 7; and 156 weeks each for advancement to salary rates 8, 9, 10. Section 5336 provides that an additional within-grade increase may be granted within any period of 52 weeks in recognition of high quality performance above that ordinarily found in the type of position concerned.
[7] The rate of pay for employees at some steps is limited by section 5308 of title 5 of the U.S. Code to the rate of level V of the Executive Schedule, $57,500.

Under Section 5303 of title 5 of the U.S. Code, higher minimum rates (but not exceeding the maximum salary rate prescribed in the General Schedule for the grade or level) and a corresponding new salary range may be established for positions or occupations under certain conditions. The conditions include a finding that the Government's recruitment or retention of well qualified persons is significantly handicapped because the salary rates in private industry are substantially above the salary rates of the statutory pay schedules. As of March 1982, special, higher salary ranges were authorized for professional engineers at the entry grades (GS-5 and GS-7), and at GS-9 and GS-11. In addition, special rates were authorized for mining engineers at GS-5 through GS-13 and for petroleum engineers at GS-5 through GS-14. Information on special salary rates, including the occupations and the areas to which they apply, may be obtained from the Office of Personnel Management, Washington, D.C. 20415, or its regional offices.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX C

AN ANALYSIS OF THE FACTOR-POINT JOB EVALUATIONS ON FILE IN THE OFFICE OF PERSONNEL

Only twenty-six jobs on the UCCP had factor-point evaluations on file in the Office of Personnel. Despite this limited number, it was thought that useful indices of the states of the UCCP might be developed from this sample. Specifically, the existing (pre-evaluation) grade at the time of the reclassification request, the new grade requested by the incumbent, the recommended grade based on the factor-point evaluation, and the actual grade finally "given" were of interest. Of the 26 positions, 14 had all four elements of information.* A by-grade listing of the 14 follows. Each listing represents a different job even though some pre-evaluation grades are the same.

No.	Pre-evaluation UCCP Grade	Requested UCCP Grade	Factor-Point Recommendation	Final UCCP Grade
1	24	33	30	30
2	27	31	29	29
3	27	31	30	30
4	29	34	31	31
5	29	33	32	32
6	32	34.5	34	34
7	33	36	31	34
8	33	36	31	33
9	34	36	32	34
10	34	36	33	34
11	35	36	33	36
12	35	36	33	35
13	35	37	34	35
14	38	40	38	38
Average	31.6	35.0	32.4	33.2

The averages and related data indicate the following:

- The pre-evaluation grades of the various jobs represent reasonably well the UCCP range (24 to 38).
- The average increase requested is 3.4 grades, a slightly larger difference than exists between the principal and the assistant principal at each school level. Thus, on the average, the holders of these jobs felt that they were substantially undervalued.
- The factor-point results were considerably more conservative than the requests, representing an average increase of slightly less than one grade (0.8).
- The final grade decisions were, on the average, somewhat higher (0.8) than those recommended by the factor-point evaluation, but still nearly two grades lower than those requested.
- At pay grades 32 and below, the final grade and factor-point recommendations were identical. At 33 and above the differences were significant.

---

* Some of the 26 positions were new and had no existing grade; other requests had not been formally "acted upon" and so on. The 14 positions, however, do not differ to an appreciable extent from the 26.

In this latter case six of the eight factor-point results were lower than the final grade and two were the same.

- In the seven cases (UCCP 33 and above) where the factor point results were lower than the pre-evaluation grades, no downward adjustments were made in the final grade.

These 14 (or 26) jobs are, of course, an "available" sample and have all the problems associated with such samples. The results above are, however, reasonably consistent with other sources of information.

PAY GRADE CLASSIFICATIONS

JACOB'S BENCHMARK JOBS	JPAC ROB	YEAR 73-74	74-75	75-76	76-77	77-78*	78-79	79-80	80-81	81-82	82-83	Pay Grade Change from 73-74 to 82-83
Associate Superintendent	41	42	42	42	42	42	42	CON-TRACT	42	43	43	+1.0
Area Superintendent	41	41	41	41	41	41	41	CON-TRACT	41	41	41	0
Area Director I		37	37	37	37	37	39	39	39	39	39	+2.0
Area Director II	38	38	38	38	38	38	39	39	39	39	39	+1.0
Senior High Principal I	37	37	37	37	37		37.5	37.5	37.5	38	38	+1.0
Senior High Principal II		37.5	37.5	37.5	37.5		37.5	37.5	37.5	38	38	+0.5
Elementary Principal I		34.5	34.5	34.5	34.5		35.5	35.5	35.5	36	36	+1.5
Elementary Principal II	35	35	35	35	35		35.5	35.5	35.5	36	36	+1.0
Elementary Principal III		35.5	35.5	35.5	35.5		35.5	35.5	35.5	36	36	+0.5
Senior High Assistant Principal	33	33.5	33.5	33.5	33.5		33.5	33.5	33.5	35	35	+1.5
A/V Consultant	35	35	35	35	35		**XX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	**XX
Budget Analyst I		25	25	25	25	25	32	32	32	32	32	+7.0
Budget Analyst II		28	28	28	28	28	32	32	32	32	32	+4.0
Budget Analyst III	30	30	30	30	30	30	32	32	32	32	32	+2.0
Buyer	28	28	28	28	28		30	30	30	30	30	+2.0
Instructional Recruiter	31	31	31	31	31		**XX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX	**XX
Information Specialist I		25	25	25	25		31	31	31	31	31	+6.0
Information Specialist II	28	28	28	28	28		31	31	31	31	31	+3.0
Information Specialist III		31	31	31	31		31	31	31	31	31	0
Duplicating Service Supervisor	27	27	27	27	27		31	31	34	34	34	+7.0

*Pay grades in the 1977-78 U.C.C.P. manual were incomplete. Several job consolidations that became effective in 1978-79 are noted by the brackets.

**Job eliminated

APPENDIX E

1982-83 SALARY SCHEDULE, X-7

FOR ADMINISTRATORS AND SUPERVISORS

PAY GRADE	MIN. STEP 1	STEP 2	STEP 3	STEP 4	STEP 5	STEP 6	STEP 7	MAX. STEP 8
23	$18,184	18,980	19,811	20,677	21,582	22,527	23,511	24,541
24	18,980	19,811	20,677	21,582	22,527	23,511	24,541	25,614
25	19,811	20,677	21,582	22,527	23,511	24,541	25,614	26,735
26	20,677	21,582	22,527	23,511	24,541	25,614	26,735	27,905
27	21,582	22,527	23,511	24,541	25,614	26,735	27,905	29,125
28	22,527	23,511	24,541	25,614	26,735	27,905	29,125	30,400
29	23,511	24,541	25,614	26,735	27,905	29,125	30,400	31,730
30	24,541	25,614	26,735	27,905	29,125	30,400	31,730	33,118
31	25,614	26,735	27,905	29,125	30,400	31,730	33,118	34,567
32	26,735	27,905	29,125	30,400	31,730	33,118	34,567	36,110
33	27,905	29,125	30,400	31,730	33,118	34,567	36,110	37,657
33*	24,992	26,086	27,227	28,418	29,662	30,960	32,314	33,728
34	29,125	30,400	31,730	33,118	34,567	36,110	37,657	39,305
34*	26,086	27,227	28,418	29,662	30,960	32,314	33,728	35,202
35	30,400	31,730	33,118	34,567	36,110	37,657	39,305	41,025
35*	27,227	28,418	29,662	30,960	32,314	33,728	35,202	36,743
36	31,730	33,118	34,567	36,110	37,657	39,305	41,025	42,820
37	33,118	34,567	36,110	37,657	39,305	41,025	42,820	44,693
38	34,567	36,110	37,657	39,305	41,025	42,820	44,693	46,648
39	36,110	37,657	39,305	41,025	42,820	44,693	46,648	48,689
40	37,657	39,305	41,025	42,820	44,693	46,648	48,689	50,820
41	39,305	41,025	42,820	44,693	46,648	48,689	50,820	53,043
42	41,025	42,820	44,693	46,648	48,689	50,820	53,043	55,364
43	42,820	44,693	46,648	48,689	50,820	53,043	55,364	57,786

*10-Month

Effective: July 1, 1982

The School Board of Dade County, Florida adheres to a policy of nondiscrimination in educational programs/activities and employment and strives affirmatively to provide equal opportunity for all as required by:

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 - prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, or national origin.

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended - prohibits discrimination in employment on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.

Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 - prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex.

Age Discrimination Act of 1967, as amended - prohibits discrimination on the basis of age between 40 and 70.

Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 - prohibits discrimination against the handicapped.

Veterans are provided re-employment rights in accordance with P.L. 93-508 (Federal) and Florida State Law, Chapter 77-422, which also stipulates categorical preferences for employment.